

**PATENT**

**KOYOP101USA**

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being submitted via the USPTO EFS Filing System on the date shown below to Mail Stop **Appeal Brief-Patents**, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

March 9, 2007  
Date

/Casey L. Martin/  
Casey L. Martin

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re patent application of:

Appellant(s): Jeasung Jay Yoo

Serial No: 10/772,610

Filing Date: February 5, 2004

Examiner: Alissa L. Hoey

Art Unit: 3765

Title: GARMENT AND DETACHABLE GARMENT LINER HAVING A SECURE  
AND INTEGRATED POCKET SYSTEM

**Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents**  
**Commissioner for Patents**  
**P.O. Box 1450**  
**Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

---

**LETTER RE SECOND EXAMINER'S ANSWER OF FEBRUARY 13, 2007**

---

Dear Sir:

Appellants' representative submits this letter to clarify an issue in connection with an appeal of the above-identified patent application. In the event any additional fees may be due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [KOYOP101USA].

**Examiner's Answers Dated December 7, 2006 and February 13, 2007**

An Examiner's Answer dated December 7, 2006 had been received in response to Appellant's Appeal Brief. A Reply Brief responsive to the Examiner's Answer was transmitted to the PTO on January 29, 2007, and acknowledgement had been received. A second Examiner's Answer was received dated February 13, 2007. The second Examiner's Answer is identical to the first with the exception of section (8). In the first Examiner's Answer, section (8) stated that no evidence was relied upon by the Examiner in the rejection of the claims under appeal. The second Examiner's Answer lists the prior art of record as evidence.

Appellant acknowledges the new citation of evidence in the Examiner's Answer of February 13, 2007. This second Examiner's Answer does not indicate that it should supersede the first Examiner's Answer, nor is it indicated that this document is responsive to the Reply Brief. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the Reply Brief submitted January 29, 2007 is complete and fully responsive to both Examiner's Answers, and therefore a second Reply Brief is not necessary. Appellant respectfully requests that the Appeal proceed as indicated.

**CONCLUSION**

For at least the above reasons, it is maintained that the claims currently under consideration are believed to be patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 1-12 and 27-28 be reversed.

If any additional fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. [KOYOP101USA].

Respectfully submitted,  
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/  
Himanshu S. Amin  
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>th</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Telephone: (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile: (216) 696-8731